

Serial No. 09/914,706

REMARKS

The Advisory Action dated April 19, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In response thereto, applicant proposes to amend claim 21 to include the limitations of claim 24, amend claim 28 to include the limitations of claims 31 and 32, cancel claims 24, 26, 31 and 32 and amend claim 25, all in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 24, 25 and 32 contain allowable subject matter. Independent claim 21 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of claims 21 and 24. Independent claim 28 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of claims 28, 31 and 32 except for the extra word "ring" from claim 32 as noted by the Examiner. Dependent claims 24, 26, 31 and 32 have been cancelled. Dependent claims 22-23, 25 and 27 are dependent on rewritten claim 21. Dependent claims 29-30 and 33-44 are dependent on rewritten claim 28. The Section 112 rejection is believed to be overcome as discussed

Serial No. 09/914,706

hereinafter. Accordingly, claims 21-23, 25, 27-30 and 33-44 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 21-27 have been rejected because the terms "constant" in claim 21 and "even" in claim 26 are allegedly indefinite. To overcome the rejection, claim 26 has been cancelled. Similar language has been removed from claim 25. It is respectfully submitted that the skilled artisan would recognize that a "constant flow" would be a flow which does not vary. In view of the amendment, it is believed that these claims are no longer indefinite so the Section 112 rejection should be withdrawn. As indicated in the Advisory Action, cancellation of claim 26 would overcome the Section 112 rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103, (1) claims 21-23, 26-31, 33-39 and 44 stand rejected as being completely shown by Schmit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,475,395); (2) claims 41-43 stand rejected on the grounds of alleged obviousness based on the Schmit et al. patent; and (3) claim 40 stands rejected on the grounds of alleged obviousness by

Serial No. 09/914,706

combining the Schmit et al. patent with Hinde (U.S. Patent No. 3,293,861) or GB 2 326 603A.

Since independent claim 21 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of allowable dependent claim 24 and dependent claims 22-23, 25 and 27 are dependent on claim 21, the rejections of claims 21-23 and 27 are believed to be moot and should be withdrawn. Similarly, since independent claim 28 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of allowable dependent claim 32 and intervening claim 31 and dependent claims 29-30 and 33-44 are dependent on claim 28, the rejections of claims 28-30 and 33-44 are believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the final rejection, entry of the amendments and allowance of the application are believed to be in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney if any questions remain following review of this response.

Serial No. 09/914,706

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

5/14/2004

By



K. Bradford Adolphson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 30,927

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676